

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 17-23 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-14 and 17-23 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at, but is not limited to, Figure 8 and pages 26-27 of the specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-14 and 17-23 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marik, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,718 (hereafter Marik), in view of Grunert, U.S. Patent No. 6,366,878 (hereafter Grunert), and in view of Dey, U.S. Patent No. 5,438,672 (hereafter Dey). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Focusing on Independent Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey because the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey fails to disclose and fails to make obvious all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 is directed to an In-Circuit Emulation system breakpoint control and recites, "a microcontroller; a virtual microcontroller... a breakpoint lookup table utilized independent of said microcontroller," (emphasis

added). At page 5 of the Office Action, the Debug Parameter Table (Figures 1 and 2) of Marik is cited as corresponding to the breakpoint lookup table of Independent Claim 1. Further, it is discussed that a system-under-test (SUT) (20) includes a read-only memory (ROM) (30) and a microcontroller (not numbered) for executing a program under test, at Col. 2 lines 24-26 and Figures 1-2 of Marik. Moreover, the microcontroller executes a debugger program contained in the ROM (30), according to Col. 2 lines 27-34 of Marik. Further, the debugger program (executed by the microcontroller) uses the Debug Parameter Table as a look-up table to determine what actions (e.g., to take at a debugpoint, at Col. 8 lines 44-Col. 9 line 15 of Marik. That is, the Debug Parameter Table (or breakpoint lookup table) is utilized by the microcontroller instead of being utilized independent of the microcontroller, as in Independent Claim 1. Grunert and Dey also fail to disclose a breakpoint lookup table utilized independent of the microcontroller, as in Independent Claim 1.

As discussed above, the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey does not disclose and does not make obvious all the claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-6 and 21 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-6 and 21 are

patentable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey for the reasons discussed above.

Independent Claims 7 and 14 recite limitations similar to limitations of Independent Claim 1. Specifically, Independent Claims 7 and 14 recite the limitation, “utilizing said breakpoint lookup table independent of said microcontroller,” (emphasis added). As discussed above, the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey fails to disclose this limitation. Therefore, Independent Claims 7 and 14 are patentable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey and are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 8-13 and 22 and Dependent Claims 17-20 and 23 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 7 and 14, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 8-13 and 22 and Dependent Claims 17-20 and 23 are patentable over the combination of Marik, Grunert, and Dey for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-14 and 17-23) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-14 and 17-23) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES, LLP

Dated:

4/4/2008

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060